



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/899,688      | 07/05/2001  | Stephen G. Nelson    | 744-P-6             | 3493             |

7590 11/07/2002

Gregory J. Nelson  
NELSON & ROEDIGER  
Suite 212  
3333 E. Camelback Road  
Phoenix, AZ 85018

EXAMINER

GRAY, LINDA LAMEY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1734

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2002

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 09/899,688             | NELSON, STEPHEN G.  |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | Linda L Gray           | 1734                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 July 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

|  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION****Specification**

**1.** The use of trademarks has been noted in this application. They should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

**2.** The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

**3. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a substrate having a second surface with dark colored adhesive thereon, does not reasonably provide enablement for a second surface with a dark colored surface where an adhesive is then applied thereto. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.**

The specification indicates that the adhesive is the dark colored material applied to the substrate to make such dark colored on one side. Then the liner is applied over the adhesive. However, claim 14 recites the addition of an adhesive layer over a dark colored surface of the substrate followed by the addition of a liner to the adhesive. Thus, claim 14 essentially adds a second layer (i.e., and adhesive layer) not discussed within the specification.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

**4.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.



Art Unit: 1734

**5. Claims 1-7 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shields (US 5,773,110) in view of Andriash (US 5,679,435) and Mimura et al. (US 5,002,825).**

**Claim 1,** Shields teaches a method for producing a one-way see-thru panel (c 1, L 1-9).

The method includes (a) providing opaque light colored substrate 80 having opposite first and second surfaces, (b) applying dark pigmented adhesive 82, (c ) applying release liner 83 over adhesive 82, (d) perforating substrate 80 and liner 83 with a distinct hole pattern, (e) applying an imperforate barrier 85 over liner 83, and (f) applying an image to the second surface of substrate 80 via printing or painting (c 5, L 9-24).

*Shield does not teach applying the image by inkjet printing.*

Andriash teaches a method for producing see-thru panel including applying an image to a substrate via printing or painting where printing includes inkjet printing (c 5, last para).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields applying the image by inkjet printing because Andriash teaches in the same art that inkjet printing is an alternative to painting where Shields teach painting or printing and it is obvious to replace one method of applying an image with another art recognized alternative method for applying an image.

*Shields modified does not teach an inkjet encapsulating coat under the image.*

Mimura et al. teach that printing with inkjet printers often includes a long drying time, a non-smooth surface, poor transcription, and blotting leading to an unclear image. Mimura et al. teach overcoming these shortcomings by providing an inkjet encapsulating coat under an inkjet printed image (c 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields modified an inkjet encapsulating coat under the

Art Unit: 1734

image because Mimura et al. teach that printing with inkjet printers often includes a long drying time, a non-smooth surface, poor transcription, and blotting leading to an unclear image and that such can be overcome by providing an inkjet encapsulating coat under an inkjet printed image.

With respect to the claim limitation of the coating being applied before perforating, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields modified application of the coating before perforating to avoid application of the coating within the perforations which would distort the ability to view of image.

**Claim 2,** *Shields does not teach a specific material for panel 80, i.e., that panel 80 is a polymer (plastic) of polyester, vinyl, or polyolefins.*

However, display panels of polymers (i.e., plastic) of these materials are conventional because such are slightly flexible and conform well to slightly configured surfaces, and for this reason it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields that panel 80 is a polymer (plastic).

**Claim 3,** in Shields modified the coating includes a resin because Mimura teach such.

**Claim 4,** Shields teaches a method for producing signage for application to a transparent substrate which is a window (c 1, L 1-9). The method includes (a) providing opaque light colored substrate 80 having opposite first and second surfaces, (b) applying pigmented adhesive 82 to the first surface, (c ) applying release liner 83 over adhesive 82, (d) perforating substrate 80 and liner 83 with a distinct hole pattern, (e) laminating an imperforate barrier 85 over liner 83, and (f) applying an image to the second surface of substrate 80 via printing or painting (c 5, L 9-24). Shields teaches removing barrier 85 and liner 83 to expose adhesive 8 and contacting adhesive 82 to the transparent substrate; however, it is noted that

Art Unit: 1734

these claimed steps are intended use limitations of the article made by the claimed method only. Such are not considered part of the claimed method upon which patentability is based.

*Shield does not teach applying the image by inkjet printing.*

In view of Andriash, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields applying the image by inkjet printing because Andriash teaches in the same art that inkjet printing is an alternative to painting where Shields teach painting or printing and it is obvious to replace one method of applying an image with another art recognized alternative method for applying an image.

*Shields modified does not teach an inkjet encapsulating coat under the image.*

In view of Mimura et al., it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields modified an inkjet encapsulating coat under the image because Mimura et al. teach that printing with inkjet printers often includes a long drying time, a non-smooth surface, poor transcription, and blotting leading to an unclear image and that such can be overcome by providing an inkjet encapsulating coat under an inkjet printed image.

With respect to the claim limitation of the coating being applied before perforating, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields modified application of the coating before perforating to avoid application of the coating within the perforations which would distort the ability to view of image.

*Shields does not teach a specific material for panel 80, i.e., that panel 80 is a polymer (plastic).*

However, display panels of polymers (i.e., plastic) are conventional because such are slightly flexible and conform well to slightly configured surfaces, and for this reason it would

Art Unit: 1734

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields that panel 80 is a polymer (plastic).

***Claims 5-7, Shields modified does not teach inks that are dye based, pigmented, or solvent based (claim 5) and does not teach piezo ink applicators or thermal ink applicators (claims 6-7).***

However, such dyes and applicators are conventional in the art, and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields modified these inks and applicators because it is obvious to replace one type of ink and applicator with other art recognized alternative inks and applicators used for the same purpose.

**Claim 11,** Shields teaches a method for producing printable signage for application to a transparent substrate which is a window (c 1, L 1-9). The method includes (a) providing opaque light colored substrate 80 having opposite first and second surfaces with pigmented adhesive 82 (i.e., dark) on one of the surfaces and (b) perforating substrate to provide see through visibility when viewed from the adhesive side surface (c 5, L 9-24). Shields also teaches applying an image to the other surface of substrate 80 via printing or painting.

*Shield does not teach applying the image by inkjet printing over an inkjet encapsulating coat.*

In view of Andriash and Mimura et al., it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields applying the image by inkjet printing because Andriash teaches in the same art that inkjet printing is an alternative to painting where Shields teach painting or printing and it is obvious to replace one method of applying an image with another art recognized alternative method for applying an image. Also, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields modified an inkjet encapsulating coat under the image because Mimura et al. teach that printing with inkjet printers often includes a long drying time, a non-smooth surface, poor transcription, and blotting leading to an unclear image and

Art Unit: 1734

that such can be overcome by providing an inkjet encapsulating coat under an inkjet printed image.

**Claims 11 and 12,** Shields does not teach a specific material for panel 80, i.e., that panel 80 is a polymer (plastic) of polyester, vinyl, or polyolefins.

However, display panels of polymers (i.e., plastic) of these materials are conventional because such are slightly flexible and conform well to slightly configured surfaces, and for this reason it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided in Shields that panel 80 is a polymer (plastic).

**Claim 13,** in Shields modified the coating includes a resin because Mimura et al. teach such. **Claim 14,** Shields teaches applying adhesive 84 and liner 85 on the adhesive side surface. **Claim 15,** as shown above, Shields modified teaches applying an image to the other surface of panel 80.

### **Conclusion**

6. Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications should be directed Linda L. Gray at 703-308-1093, 6:30am-4:00pm, M-F. The examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino, can be reached on 703-308-3853. Any general inquiries should be directed to the receptionist at 703-308-0661. The fax numbers are 703-305-7718 (before final) and 703-872-9311 (after final).

llg *llg*  
November 5, 2002

*Linda L. Gray*  
LINDA GRAY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER